THE METROPOLIS.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

The next Sessions at the Central Criminal Court will begin on Monday, the 9th of February. Mr. Justice Wright will be the presiding Judge, and this will be the first time he has sat at the Old Bailey for over six years, he having during this period been engaged with the Court of Appeal, Winding-up, Bankruptcy, and Railway and Canal Commission business.

PRACTICAL, BUT NASTY.

In the examinations which have just closed for certificates in sanitary inspection under the Public Health (London) Act, specimens of condemned foods were furnished from the Health Department of the Corporation, and also from specimens arranged by Dr. Collingridge, Medical Officer of Health, for inspection by the candidates included among the foods condemned in the City—the livers and kidneys of sheep, indicating the presence of "flukes" and "cysts" pock with tubercular deposit, pears, plums, and other fruits in collapsed and leaky tins, and in an unwholesome condition.

THE CITY REMEMBRANCERSHIP.

The Officers' and Clerks' Committee of the Corporation, to whom was referred the consideration of the duties and emoluments of the office of Remembrancer, vacant by the recent resignation of Sir Prior Goldner, have decided to recommend to the Court of Common Council that the duties should be virtually as heretofore, and that the salary should be £1,500. They suggest that the age of candidates should not exceed fifty years, and that they should be empowered to select five for the ultimate choice of the Court. There is no stipulation as to legal or other qualifications. The candidates before the Court include Mr. Ellis, Parliamentary Agent, of Plymouth; Mr. Alan Pollock, Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke, Mr. Arthur Du Cane, Mr. Stuart Sanker, Sir Thomas Fry, Mr. W. H. Macklin, Mr. Prideham Wippell, Mr. Beaumont Morice, Mr. W. H. Davison, and possibly others. The election is likely to take place at the end of February.

BOGUS VICTORIA CROSS MAN.

At Lambeth County Court yesterday Judge Emden, sitting in the last sitting of this Court in the case Johnson v. Freedman, the plaintiff swore that he was a Victoria Cross man, and that his pay was in arrear. From inquiries made by the officer of the Court, it appears that this was a grossly false statement. Johnson has admitted to the officer that he was not a Victoria Cross man. He has also made a recantation from the War Office that no complaint had been made either at that office or at the Reservists' Office by Johnson as to arrears of pay. The man has been invited to attend the hearing to make an explanation, but he has not put in an appearance. I cannot punish him for perjury because the statements in question were not relevant to the issue, but it is a great pity that such wicked misstatements should be made, as they are seriously injurious to deserving cases.

SIDELIGHT ON "UNEMPLOYED" MARCHES.

Last night, at the meeting of the Guardians of the Strand Union, Mr. R. Dodson presiding, Mr. J. W. Wood (Chairman of the Workhouse Committee) said that at the last meeting of the Guardians 40 applications had been received from men—a thing unprecedented at this season of the year—for leave of absence on the plea that they could not find work. They knew very well that they could not get employment at the present period of the year, and had resorted to this subterfuge to join the unemployed processions with which Londoners had now been so familiar for some weeks past. With the money collected they purchased beer, and he anticipated that at the next meeting of the Committee of the Edmonton Workhouse a large number would be reported for punishment. Mr. A. Sugar (Guardian) observed that hundreds of "unemployed" processionists were workhouse inmates and tramps. The matter then dropped.

ROYAL MATERNITY CHARITY.

The annual meeting of the Governors of this old-established Institution was held yesterday at the charity's house, 31, Finsbury-square, Mr. C. Barham presiding, in the unavoidable absence of Lord Avebury, the President. The report, which was read by Mr. J. W. Long, the secretary, stated that the patients relieved during the year was 3,749. Owing to the many applicants, it was found necessary to limit the number of deserving applicants, but in fact the house was never full, and the bankers the committee had felt themselves compelled to limit the amount of help given. The triennial festival dinner in aid of the funds was to be held in May, presided over by Dr. Fancourt Barnes. The committee had received with satisfaction that Queen Alexandra had consented to become patron to the charity in succession to its late Queen Victoria. The report was adopted, and at a special meeting subsequently held the committee were empowered to raise £3,000 of the funds by mortgage of the institution in order to liquidate a debt of £2,000 due to the bankers, and to meet other liabilities.

A MISER'S WRETCHED END.

In the Hammersmith Coroner's Court yesterday Mr. Lewis Thomas Drew held an inquest on the body of Arthur Green, 31, of Wendell-road, Shepherd's-bush. The evidence showed that the deceased, who was formerly employed in the Army and Navy Stores, suffered from rheumatism, and had a particular stroke. He lived alone in one of the above address, and attended to his own wants. The landlady never entered his room, and although he had been ill lately he refused to have a doctor or any attendance. On Thursday, however, the landlord insisted on calling in the parish doctor, who ordered deceased's removal to the infirmary. Before this could be done a woman called. The only food deceased had had of late had been given to him by his landlady, who thought he was in straitened circumstances, but a search of his room revealed a valuable gold watch and chain, securities in the Post-Office Savings Bank, Consols, railway shares, and in the Birkbeck Bank Building Society, Freehold Land Society, Office of the National Penny Bank, to the value of £1,000. There being no known relatives, the Solicitors to the Treasury will take possession of the property on behalf of the Crown.—Dr. Reake said death was due to pneumonia and heart disease.—Verdict accordingly.

On Friday, at 11 p.m., a Grand Ice Carnival will take place at the National Skating Palace, Oxfordstreet, W. Prizes will be given for the best costumes, races, etc.

An open conference of Liberals and members of the Labour party, to discuss the question of combining for Parliamentary purposes, will be held at the Sun School, Fort Street, Public Hall, Croydon, on Tuesday next, at 8 p.m.

TO-DAY.

Lighting-up time, 5.32.
Sun rises, 7.47; sets, 4.28.
High Water at London Bridge: Morning, 1.57; afternoon, 2.25.
Stolen Dogs at the Battersea Home, 1 to 4.
Dr. R. J. Torrey and Mr. Alexander, American Evangelists, at Great Conference Hall, Mildmay Park, 3 and 7.30.
Whitefield Memorial Church, Tottenham-court-road "Special Services for Lovers of Music."
Mr. Gerald Balfour at Newport Chamber of Commerce.
Dinner to Chancellor of Exchequer, Crystal Palace Beaconsfield Club.
Lecture by Aria—Dr. H. Davies on "Municipal Building Societies."
Lord Mayor's Tariffs at West Indian Club Banquet, Hotel Cecil.
Chapman and Cambell Prize Concert, 10.30.
Mr. Asquith, M.P., at Hull.
Marriage Licenses, 1, High Holborn.
Tobacco Trade Meeting, Memorial Hall, 3.
Tenterden Volunteer Engineers, Kingsnorth, 4.30.
Prizes to Victoria and St. George's Rifles, 8.45.
Lambeth Baths Public Baths, Cannon-street Hotel, 8.
Hoe Lane Fire Experiments at Southwark, 12.
South Place Institute—S. M. Robertson on "Constitutional Government in Free Trade," 7.30.
British Cotton Growing Association, Manchester Town Hall, 12.30.
Taxation of Land Values, Mildmay Radical Club, 8.
Passing of Premature Burial, 44, Gloucester-place.
Religious Liberal Association—R. Foston on "Modern Liberalism," New Reform Club, 8.30.
Rev. T. Wenger Jones Preaches at Bishopsgate Chapel at 1.55.
Drapers' Meetings:
British Gas Lights—11, George-yard, 12.
Gas Hydraulic Mining—Cutlers' Hall, Devonshire-square, 3.
Gas Mining—Winchester House, 11.
Eastern Telegraph—River Plate House, 1.
Phosphor and Sulphur Gold Mining—Winchester House, 2.
Financial Stock and Other Securities Investment—Winchester House, 12.
Great Eastern Railway—Cannon-street Hotel, 12.
Howell, John and Co.—5, St. Paul's-churchyard, 4.
London, Brighton and South Coast Railway—Bridge-road Station, 1.
London and Brazilian Bank—Cannon-street Hotel, 12.
Northern Territory Lands—Winchester House, 12.
Royal Bank of Ireland—Bank of Ireland, Dublin, 12.
Royal Aquarium—Westminster, 5.30, 7.30.
Royal Institution of London and Smith's Bank—2, Princes-street, 12.

Pavilion, from 10.
Empire, 2.45 and 8.15; Olympia, 2 and 8.15.
Drury Lane Pantomime, 1.30 and 7.30.
London Hippodrome, 2 and 7.45.
Madame Tussaud's, from 9.
London Pavilion, 2 and 8.
"The Devil's Forge," at the Alhambra, 8.
The Milliner Duchess, at the Empire, 8.
Palace Theatre, 8.
Queen Hall, 3 and 8.
Royal Academy (Winter Exhibition), 9 to 5.

LAW AND POLICE.

DENABY MINERS' LITIGATION.

THE APPEAL DISMISSED.

In the Court of Appeal yesterday, before Lords Justices Vaughan Williams, Stirling, and Mathew, the hearing of the appeal of the plaintiff, Howden v. Yorkshire Miners' Association and others was continued. It was an application by defendant trade union and others for a mandatory or new trial in an action tried before Mr. Justice Grantham and a special jury a short time back. The action was brought by one Howden, a miller, against that association and certain of its officers for an injunction to restrain the defendants from committing a breach of the rules of the association by giving relief to the miners now out on strike at the pits of the Denaby and Cadeby Collieries, near Doncaster. At the trial judgment was entered for the plaintiff, and the injunction asked for was granted.

There was some argument as to the desirability of joining the Crown in the action. Lord Justice Vaughan Williams ultimately promising that the trustees should be safeguarded "from anything which in our judgment would subject them to any costs or any proceedings are taken against them in respect of the past to raise any defence which it would have been open to them to raise in the action."

Arguments on the main issue in the case were then proceeded with.

THE JUDGMENT.

Lord Justice Vaughan Williams, in giving judgment, said the plaintiff claimed, as a member of the association, an injunction to restrain the defendants, officers, members, and servants, from misapplying the funds of the association and dealing with the same contrary to the rules of the association, and the trust and visions contained therein. It was desirable to remember that the action was for an injunction on both sides, in occasionally somewhat passionate oratory, had addressed the Court on the assumption that the action was for an injunction against the men, which it was not. There were really two questions raised by the case. The first was a question of law, and the second a question partly of the construction of certain rules and partly of fact, the inference of fact, it may be, to be drawn from certain documents and certain admitted facts. The second question was whether there had been in this case such a misappropriation of funds as was sought to be restained in this action. With regard to the question of law, it was put in two ways. It was said first that the right to bring this action by the plaintiff as a member of the Yorkshire Miners' Association was conferred by the Trade Union Act of 1871, and that if the provisions of that statute were looked into it would be found that the plaintiff was not only entitled to bring the action, but was really prohibited from bringing it. That argument was based mainly upon Section 4 of the Trade Union Act, 1871. Beyond that it was said that the plaintiff was entitled if the statement under this section could not be maintained the plaintiff was the wrong person to bring the action. It was said that possibly this was an action that might be brought by persons who were called employees, and whose position was defined by Sections 9 and 11 of the Trade Union Act, and that inasmuch as it was being brought by such trustees, but by the plaintiff and without any reference on the writ to his suing to enforce the rights of employees, the ground of objection other than himself. Those were the short grounds upon which the main arguments had been raised.

FUTILE ATTEMPT AT SETTLEMENT.

They had made an attempt to get the questions amicably settled. They tried to do that by endeavouring to put before both masters and men what might reasonably have been grounds upon which the action could be settled, and, of course, if the masters and the men could have come to terms the question of the plaintiff's right to bring an injunction of more moneys would have fallen to the ground. But the masters and the men could not arrange any terms. There was also an effort made to arrive at certain agreed acts and facts upon which the case might be referred to the evidence at the trial, and without reference to suggested misdirection by any source and another at the trial. Again, they were not entirely successful, because, when they approached an agreement between counsel on facts on which they might have disposed of the case, it became the duty of the Court to point out that, according to practice, the trustees, although no relief was claimed against them of any sort or kind, ought to be before the Court for the proper constitution of the action. They had been asked to consider the question of what should be restrained from misappropriating the funds that the Court had decided they must be joined. Having dealt at great length with other points raised, the Lord Justice said the conclusion he had come to was that in the circumstances the order for the injunction was quite right and should stand. In dismissing the appeal care must be taken in drawing up the order that the trustees had the protection which the Court had decided they ought to have.

Lords Justices Stirling and Mathew gave judgment to the same effect.

The appeal was accordingly dismissed.

LONDON AND NORTHERN BANK CASE.

The hearing of the case of Broome v. Speak and others was yesterday concluded in the Court of Appeal, composed of the Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Romer and Cozens-Hardy, on the appeal of the defendants from a judgment of Mr. Justice Buckley in the Chancery Division.

In this action the plaintiff, a shareholder in the London and Northern Bank (Limited), sued the three defendants—Morton B. Speak, A. J. Shepherd, and C. H. Clayton, three of the directors of the bank—claiming a declaration that the company's prospectus was fraudulent on the ground of the defendants' having been knowingly issued it without specifying the dates and names of the parties to certain contracts. The interpenetrating defendants in the law fraud the acquirement of the business of the Leeds Joint Stock Bank, the particulars arrangement so drawn up in the first prospectus issued being altered in the final prospectus. Mr. Justice Buckley found in favour of the plaintiff, and made the declaration asked for, and directed an inquiry as to damages. Hence the present appeal of the defendants.

During the hearing of the arguments of counsel, all charges of conspiracy and fraud against the defendants were withdrawn.

In the result their lordships upheld the decision of Mr. Justice Buckley, and dismissed the appeal, with costs.

ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATION.

Yesterday, in the King's Bench Division, Mr. Justice Ridley and a special jury concluded the hearing of the case of Pressland v. De Meray.

The action was brought by Mr. W. T. Pressland, an electrical engineer, of Broad Sanctuary, Westminster, who claimed to recover from Mr. Jules De Meray the sum of £5,500 damages for deceit, alleged to have been brought about by the defendant's misrepresentation in regard to the position of the Sir Hiram Maxim Electrical and Engineering Company Limited, of which the defendant was chairman. Defendant denied misrepresentation.

After an absence of half an hour, the jury found a verdict for plaintiff. A stay of execution was granted. Costs to be added to the judgment.

His lordship remarked that in his opinion the verdict was against the weight of evidence, but, of course, the matter would be dealt with elsewhere.

ABUSE OF "BREACH" ACTIONS.

Before Mr. Justice Darling and a common jury, in the King's Bench Division, Mr. Bodkin Foster sued Mr. "Jack" Tizard for damages for alleged breach of promise of marriage. Mr. Davis appeared for the plaintiff, and Mr. Hutton for the defendant.—According to counsel's statement, the plaintiff was a dressmaker, but having a good voice she also accepted engagements. The defendant was a young man from Manitoba, and in February, 1901, met the plaintiff at a Covent Garden ball. He said: "From that time they were in frequent communication, and on the 29th March last year the Court said he asked her to accompany him to a music hall at Budapest at £3 a week.—Defendant denied any promise of marriage, and declared that the plaintiff first spoke to him of the hall.—His Lordship drew attention to the abuses of which an action for breach of promise might be made for the purposes of blackmail.—The jury found for the defendant, and judgment was given accordingly.—His Lordship handed the letters to the defendant's solicitor, as he did not desire that any improper use should be made of them again. The Judge also remarked that the plaintiff might think herself very lucky that prosecutions for perjury did not often follow such cases.

TITLED PEOPLE IN THE DOCK.

On a warrant granted on the application of Detective-Inspector Fuller, of Scotland Yard, the Countess Cathcart, formerly Miss Ada Anstrum Array—so his visiting cards set out—Imrn, the Countess Raday, an Hungarian subject, and Emma Holland, per maid, were yesterday charged at Westminster Police-court with conspiracy to obtain, and with obtaining, by false pretences, sums of many thousands of pounds by fraud and false representations.

The Countess, a young woman, was most fashionably attired, and, with the other prisoners, was seated in the dock during the proceedings.

There was a lengthy sworn information before the Court setting out the charge against the prisoners, living at various addresses, had purchased clothing, furs, jewellery, and property of every description, for the Countess and the Baron and the Countess using armorial stamped paper and bank notes, which they had received in receipt of large means from their respective relatives. It was stated that the income of the Countess from Bodoh-Array estates was £60 a year, and that the very valuable property purchased in consequence of the representations pawned. Inspector Fuller also stated in his information that the Countess and Baron had lived lately in a furnished flat at Grosvenor Mansions, Westminster, that there over £60 was due for rent, and that the Countess had stated about the accused had reached the police.

Dealing to the arrest of the three prisoners, Inspector Fuller said that on searching their flat he found 115 pawn-tickets of recent date, and also a number of pawn-tickets and other, relating to property of the value of over £2,000, belonging to the Baron and Countess Cathcart. The Countess had no money, the Baron but 8s., and the maid had pawn-tickets, and was going to a clock belonging to the flat. Referring to that, she said, "Yes, I am very sorry. I meant to have put that back today." The pawn-tickets mostly referred to expensive clothing and jewellery, and when attention was drawn to it the Baron remarked, "We have nothing but what we stand upright in." And, added Inspector Fuller, "The Countess said that she was not so much as a pair of socks besides the clothes they stood in." Everything they had had been pawned. There will be many other charges, for they have been living by this means for the last two years at least," he said.

Mr. Horace Smith remanded all the prisoners, and confirmed for the legal aid of the Treasury to conduct the prosecution.

GREAT ROBBERIES.

George Smith, 30, of Ingatestone, of Essex-road, Islington; and Charles Peters, aged 32, working jeweller, of Peabody-buildings, Islington, were brought up on remand at Worship-street Police-court yesterday charged with jointly and severally in stealing and receiving large quantities of goods.

Mr. Rowe, from the Solicitors Department of the Treasury, prosecuted; Mr. S. Myers, solicitor, defended Peters; Mr. Parker, solicitor, defended Smith. The case has been before the Court on three occasions, the evidence showing conspiracy between the prisoners to steal large quantities of goods with horses and vehicles being driven off—and several instances of warehouse breaking, the property being disposed of in a manner.

The first that came to light of the matter was the discovery of a quantity of stolen goods, by Detective-Sergeant M'Kenna, G Division, from information received that had been deposited in a place, and on the 24th Jan. a large quantity of glue had been stolen from a warehouse belonging to Messrs. Cooper and Nephew, to the arrest of Peters, and in the flat occupied by the latter an enormous quantity of property was found. The publication of the facts of the discovery led to owners of some of the goods identifying their property, and the prisoners were now committed for trial on the following charges: The prisoner Smith for receiving glue, stolen in Deptford, and the property of Messrs. Cooper and Nephew; the prisoners Smith and Peters, jointly charged and committed for receiving a quantity of glue, the property of Messrs. Cooper and Nephew; the prisoner Smith